

Remarks/Arguments:

The present invention relates to a optical communications module. As shown in Applicants' Figure 3, substrate 6 completely surrounds the circumference of either the first transmission line or the second transmission line (1, 1). It is because the substrate completely surrounds the circumference of either transmission line that the optical axis of optical components 4A, 4B and the optical axis of devices 8, 9 are matched.

Claims 15 and 28-31 have been objected to because of language problems. Claims 15, 28 and 31 have been appropriately amended. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 14 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dautartas (U.S. Patent No. 5,257,336). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over Dautartas for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record; namely:

... an edge of said substrate which defines said cavity completely surrounds a circumference of at least one of said first and said second optical transmission line.

As explained above, and as illustrated, for example, in Applicants' Figure 3, substrate 6 completely surrounds the circumference of either transmission line 1. This configuration matches optical axes between devices and their respective optical components.

Dautartas includes substrate 12 on whose surface a cavity is formed. Dautartas substrate 12, however, does not completely surround transmission line 28. In face, Dautartas discloses item 2 which blocks substrate 12 from completely surrounding transmission line 28. Accordingly, Applicants' claim 1 is patentable over Dautartas. Claim 23, while not identical to claim 1, is also patentable over Dautartas for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

The remaining rejected dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 14, 21 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Beranek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,896,481). It is respectfully submitted, however, that Applicants' claims are patentable over Beranek for the reasons set forth below.

Beranek, Figures 3A - 3D illustrate substrate 200. Optical transmission line 220 is shown inserted within a cavity of substrate 200. In contrast with Applicants' claim 1, however, Beranek lacks Applicants' claimed feature of:

... an edge of said substrate ... completely surrounds a circumference of ... said ... transmission.

As previously explained, the use of Applicants' substrate surrounding a circumference of Applicants' transmission line enables matching of an optical access of one device with the optical access of an optical component. As this feature is lacking from Beranek, Applicants' claim 1 is patentable over Beranek.

Applicants' claim 23, while not identical to claim 1, is also patentable over Beranek for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

The remaining rejected claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8-11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23 and 25-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 7,004,644). Figure 1A of Johnson includes transmission line 25. Substrate 15 is also shown. As further illustrated by Figure 1A, transmission line 25 does not extend into a cavity formed within substrate 15. Thus, again, Applicants' claimed feature of "said cavity completely surrounds a circumference of ... said transmission line" is not disclosed. Accordingly, Applicants' claim 1 is patentable over Johnson.

Applicants' claim 23, while not identical to claim 1, is also patentable over Johnson for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Application No.: 10/500,529
Amendment Dated: June 13, 2006
Reply to Office Action of: March 23, 2006


MAT-8573US

The remaining rejected claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dautartas. Also, claims 18 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek. These claims, however, are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/ds/fp

Dated: June 13, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

June 13, 2006



FP_31718v1